



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/760,499 | 01/11/2001 | Shunpei Yamazaki | 07977/263001/US4563 | 2176 |

7590 02/05/2004
SCOTT C. HARRIS
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Suite 500
4350 La Jolla Village Drive
San Diego, CA 92122

EXAMINER

GOFF II, JOHN L

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

1733

DATE MAILED: 02/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/760,499

Applicant(s)

YAMAZAKI ET AL.

Examiner

John L. Goff

Art Unit

1733

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-6, 16-19, 21-24, 26-30, 32-34 and 36-42.


Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 7-15, 20, 25, 31, 35 and 43.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☐ Other: _____

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues "Even assuming (only for the sake of argument) the validity of the above referenced portions of the present Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the referenced PET film 124 of Yamazaki '138 cannot be said to disclose or properly suggest the third substrate as recited in independent claim 1. For example, the purpose of formation of the PET film 124 of Yamazaki '138 is to allow the liquid crystal layer 125 of that reference to be interposed between the PET film 124 and a silicon dioxide film 103. Therefore, if, as alleged by the Office Action, if Yamazaki '138 were modified to include a light-emitting element in place of the liquid crystal layer 125, the stated reason of Yamazaki for including the PET film 124 would no longer exist." It is noted using the method of Yamazaki '138 to form a display device, e.g. an EL device or a liquid-crystal device, would result in replacing the glass base substrate with a plastic (resin) film as Yamazaki '138 teaches forming a "flexible" display device and additionally, as noted by Yamazaki '138 as modified by the admitted prior art the display device should be thin and light in weight. Furthermore, it is noted a glass base substrate to form the semi-conductor element of the display device is used only because of the high heat resistance of the glass as forming a satisfactory semi-conductor element for the display device on a plastic substrate is not possible.



John L. Goff



JEFF H. AFTERGUT
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1300